



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/335,022	06/17/1999	MONIKA JOHANNSEN	20164/109730	5988

7590 10/21/2002

MARK E WADDELL ESQ /  
BRYAN CAVE LLP  
245 PARK AVENUE  
NEW YORK, NY 101670034

EXAMINER

QAZI, SABIHA NAIM

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1616

DATE MAILED: 10/21/2002

22

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/335,022

Applicant(s)

JOHANNSEN, MONIKA

Examiner

Sabiha Naim Qazi

Art Unit

1616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 July 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other:  |

Art Unit: 1616

### DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn. (See last paragraph on page 7 of appeal brief).

Amendments filed on 2/20/2002 are entered.

Claims 1-8 are pending.

All claims are rejected.

No claim is allowed.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

1. Claims 1-8 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The term "comprises" cited in claim 1 is inclusive and fails to exclude unrecited steps. The use of the term comprising to introduce claimed structure means that the ingredients covered by these claims may involve more elements than those positively recited. *Ex parte Gottzein et al.*, 168 USPQ 176 (PTO Bd. App. 1969). Comprising leaves the claim open for inclusion of unspecified ingredients even in major amounts. *Ex parte Davis et al.*, 80 USPQ 448 (PTO Bd. App. 1948).

Art Unit: 1616

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-3, 5 and 8 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for supercritical carbon dioxide, does not reasonably provide enablement for "with back-pressure regulation". The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Applicant must show the support for the amended claim. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-8 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

Art Unit: 1616

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-8 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Higashidate et al. (Journal of Chromatography, 515 (1990), 295-303) and Nakamura et al. (DN 120:220844, CAPLUS, abstract of JP 05345898). See the entire documents especially in Higashidate, abstract of the invention; 1<sup>st</sup> Para on page 296; 1<sup>st</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> Para on page 297; table 1 and last two paragraphs on page 302. Prior art cited teach separation and isolation of components on silica gel as stationary phase and supercritical carbon dioxide as mobile phase, which embraces Applicant's claimed invention. Nakamura teaches use of silica gel column chromatography in supercritical carbon dioxide separation technique.

Higashidate teaches enrichment of eicosapentaenoic acid (EPA) and docosahexaenoic acid (DHA) I from 12% to 93% and from 13% to 82% respectively. Methyl esters of EPA and DHA in esterified fish oil were extracted by supercritical fluid extraction with carbon dioxide and directly introduced into silica gel column coated with silver nitrate. Supercritical fluid chromatography with carbon dioxide was then

Art Unit: 1616

performed by changing the pressure of the column outlet. Reducing the pressure fractionated the EPA and DHA methyl esters thus separated.

Instant claims are drawn to a process for the isolation of vitamin D3 and previtamin D3 from a mixture containing them, separating vitamin D3 or previtamin D3, by normal phase column chromatographic technique using supercritical carbon dioxide as mobile phase.

Instant claims differ from the reference in claiming isolation of specific compounds vitamin D3 and previtamin D3 from the mixture whereas prior art teaches methods for separation of various compounds by supercritical carbon dioxide as instantly claimed. This technique is now commonly used.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to be motivated to separate components of the mixture by using supercritical carbon dioxide as mobile phase and silica gel as stationary phase. Size of the silica gel particle and pressure are selected depending on the type of compounds intended to isolate. One skilled in the art who is familiar with the separation techniques would know to use the size of the particles and other adjustments in order to enhance the yield of the process.

Since the extraction with super critical carbon dioxide and passing the liquid under supercritical conditions through a packed column is taught by the prior art, there is nothing unobvious is seen to separate vitamin D3 and provitamin D3 from the mixture by using supercritical carbon dioxide and silica gel for the isolation of the said compounds.

Art Unit: 1616


In the light of the forgoing discussion, the Examiner's ultimate legal conclusion is that the subject matter defined by the instant claims would have been obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

### **Telephonic Inquiry**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sabiha Naim Qazi whose telephone number is 703-305-3910. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jose Dees can be reached on 703-308-4628. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-4556 for regular communications and 703-308-4556 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1235.

October 20, 2002

  
SABIHA QAZI, PH.D  
PRIMARY EXAMINER